

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being allegedly anticipated by Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. (US 2002/0160812). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 of the Applicants' claimed invention recites a method for managing traffic channel use in a wireless communication system. The system includes establishing at least first and second communication connections in at least a first wireless communication device. Respective first and second idle periods for the first and second connections are established and a traffic channel associated with the first and second connections is released when both idle periods expire.

Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. discloses a method for managing network resources in a radio network. If a connection remains inactive for longer than a first time-out period, the network releases a portion of the RF resources dedicated to the connection, thereby making these resources available for supporting other connections. If the connection remains inactive for longer than a second time-out period, the network releases the remaining RF resources, as well as releasing other communication resources in the network dedicated to supporting the connection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. fails to disclose at least establishing respective first and second idle periods for the first and second connections as claimed by the Applicants. Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. uses two timers for only one connection and not at least first and second connections as claimed by the Applicants. Additionally, the Applicants would like to emphasize that establishing idle periods as claimed by the Applicants is not the same as simply using timers to measure elapsed time as disclosed by Moshiri-Tafreshi et al.

More specifically, in Figure 2 and paragraphs [0022] – [0023] of Moshiri-Tafreshi et al., packet data connection supervision logic for a given packet data connection is disclosed. A

supervising element within the network 10 begins timing the connection using first and second timers (block 202).

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the applied reference does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-6 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding independent claim 1 as well as all of the additionally recited features in the claims.

Claim 7 of the Applicants' claimed invention recites, *inter alia*, a wireless communication system where at least a first application runs in a socket mode and at least a second application runs in a socket mode.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. reference of at least two applications running in a socket mode. It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion of using socket mode at all in the applied reference. In paragraphs [0020] – [0021] of Moshiri-Tafreshi et al., a subscriber desiring a high-speed packet data connection is allocated both a fundamental channel, as well as a higher bandwidth fundamental channel. These referenced paragraphs also discuss that packet data connections are subject to relatively long idle periods, during which the RF resources allocated to the connection are not used.

Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the applied reference does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 7 be allowed.

Claims 8-15 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 7 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding independent claim 7 as well as all of the additionally recited features in the claims.

Claim 16 is an independent claim that recites related subject matter to independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1 as well as the additionally recited features found in these claims.

Claims 17-21 are dependent claims that depend upon independent claim 16 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding independent claim 16 as well as all of the additionally recited features found in these claims.

Claim 22 is an independent claim that recites a method for managing a traffic channel associated with a wireless communication device and plural connections selected from the group of connections including socket connections and packet connections. Moshiri-Tafreshi et al. fails to teach or suggest any reference to the use of socket connections in the manner claimed by the Applicants.

Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.”

In the Office Action, paragraphs [0015] to [0019] are referred to as teaching the aforementioned features claimed by the Applicants. It is respectfully submitted that they do not teach or suggest at least these features.

Paragraph [0015] refers to RBSs that communicate over RF channels with the access terminals and serve as an access point for access terminals desiring connection with the service provider network. Typically, there is one RBS in each sector or cell, which provides service to all access terminals within the sector or cell.

There is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.”

Paragraph [0016] refers to each RBSs connects via a communications link, such as a T1 or E1 link, to the BSC which in turn connects to the MSC and to the PDSN. The BSC includes a Packet Core Function (PCF) to manage its connection with the PDSN. The BSC may include a dedicated Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) interface supporting packet data communication and control between it and the PDN via the PDSN.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.” Furthermore, there is no mention of socket connections as claimed by the Applicants, only packet data communication.

Paragraph [0017] refers to an access terminal sending a connection request, the connection request is received by the BSC which then communicates with the MSC to allocate resources (call setup) on the A2/A5 interface for circuit-switched services. For a non-packet data call, the BSC cooperates with the MSC in performing call set up and typically uses a System Signaling 7 (SS7) signaling protocol during call set up operations with the MSC. The MSC establishes a connection with the PSTN, thereby providing access to the PSTN to the subscriber placing the call via the access terminal.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.”

Paragraph [0018] refers to when a packet data call is established, the BSC performs much the same processing as above, including authorization and call set up procedures requiring communication with the MSC and the HLR. Rather than establishing a packet data call, the BSC performs much the same processing as above, including authorization and call set up procedures requiring communication with the MSC and the HLR. However, rather than establishing a

connection with the PSTN via the MSC and allocating resources, the BSC establishes a packet data connection with the PDSN and shown in Figure 1.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.” Furthermore, there is no mention of socket connections as claimed by the Applicants, only a packet data connection.

Paragraph [0019] states that while a number of parameters determine overall capacity of the service provider network, the availability of RF resources in the RBSs and the call processing capacity of the BSC are both significant. Oftentimes, RF resources are critical as only a limited number of RF signaling resources are available in any given RBS. These resources are oftentimes critical as only a limited number of RF signaling resources are available in any given RBS. Such resources include, for example, the demodulation circuitry in an RBS that is assigned to a given access terminal.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in the applied reference of “enabling a traffic channel associated with plural applications to be released only when all applications associated with the traffic channel do not require the traffic channel.” Furthermore, there is no mention of socket connections as claimed by the Applicants, only packet data communication.

Therefore, for at least these reasons it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 22 be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 17, 2004

By: 
John L. Ciccozzi
Reg. No. 48,984
(858) 845-2611

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502